



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,396	02/18/2004	Joel M. Walker	IDF 2648 (4000-16900)	1884
28003	7590	01/26/2009		
SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			EXAMINER SHAAWAT, MUSSA A	
			ART UNIT 3627	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/26/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/781,396	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WALKER, JOEL M.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MUSSA A. SHAAWAT	<b>Art Unit</b> 3627	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-13 and 24-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response election/restriction filed on 10/08/2008. Claims 14-23 has been elected without traverse. Claims 1-13 and 24-31 have been withdrawn. Claims 14 and 23 have been amended. Claims 14-23 are pending examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a 35 U.S.C § 101 process must (1) be tied to a particular machine or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. In re Bilski et al, 88 USPQ 2d 1385 CAFC (2008); Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the particular machine to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Here, applicant's method steps are not tied to a particular machine and do not perform a transformation. Thus, the claims are non-statutory.

The mere recitation of the machine in the preamble with an absence of a machine in the body of the claim fails to make the claim statutory under 35 USC 101.

*Note the Board of Patent Appeals Informative Opinion Ex parte Langemyer et al.*

[http://iplaw.bna.com/iplw/5000/split\\_display.adp?fedfid=10988734&vname=ippqcases2&wsn=500826000&searchid=6198805&doctypeid=1&type=court&mode=doc&split=0&scm=5000&pg=0](http://iplaw.bna.com/iplw/5000/split_display.adp?fedfid=10988734&vname=ippqcases2&wsn=500826000&searchid=6198805&doctypeid=1&type=court&mode=doc&split=0&scm=5000&pg=0).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 17-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 17-20 recite “special handling function and a workflow adjustment function on received data,” this limitation renders the claims indefinite. Appropriate corrections are required by the applicant.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 14-17 and 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McConnell et al., US PG Pub. No. (2003/0074313) referred to hereinafter as McConnell.

As per claim 14, McConnell teaches a method for performing a mediation process on invoice data, the method comprising: registering a data identifier and a mediation process corresponding to the data identifier in a reference table (see at least Para 0018-0020); generating invoices from one or more data sources (see at least Para 0016-0023); identifying invoices having related mediation processes (see at least Para 0016-0021); performing the mediation process on the data related to the invoice with a mediation component on the basis of information registered in the reference table (see at least Para 0016-0023); and generating a mediated output (see at least Para 0054).

As per claim 15, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 14, wherein each data identifier identifies a data source and the corresponding mediation process relates to the mediation process to be performed on data from that data source (see at least Para 0016-023).

As per claim 16, McConnell teaches a The method of Claim 15, wherein the data is billing data (see at least Para 0016).

As per claim 17, McConnell teaches a The method of Claim 14, wherein performing the mediation includes performing the mediation process with at least one of a special handling function and a workflow adjustment function on received data (see at least Para 0016-0023).

As per claim 21, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 14, wherein the mediated output is further defined as a mediated invoice (see at least Para 0016-0023).

As per claim 22, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 14, wherein the invoices are further defined as telephone bills and wherein the mediated output is includes a portion of the call details from the telephone bill (see at least Para 0003).

As per claim 23, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 14, wherein generating invoices from one or more data sources further comprises: providing a first billing system that generates a first invoice; and providing a second billing system that generates a second invoice such that the mediated output is based on at least portions of the first and second invoices (see at least Para 0016-0023).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell.

As per claim 18, McConnell does not expressly teach performing a data transformation process in accordance with a predetermined defining structure; wherein the predetermined defining structure is an Extensible Markup Language schema. The examiner takes Official Notice that performing a data transformation on a data to an XML format is old and well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of McConnell to include performing a

Art Unit: 3627

transformation of data into an XML format in order aid the sharing of information between systems especially via the internet.

As per claim 20, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 19 further comprising retrieving data directly from a data generation unit via a direct data access controller, wherein at least one of the special handling function and the workflow adjustment function is performed on the retrieved data (see at least Para 0016-0023 and figure 1).

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to form 892 for cited references.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MUSSA A. SHAAWAT whose telephone number is (571)272-2945. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8am-5:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Florian Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mussa A Shaawat  
Examiner, Art Unit 3627  
January 8, 2009

/Ramsey Refai/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3627